

REMARKS

Applicant notes with appreciation that, in the Office Action of September 22, 2008, claims 5-9 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, claims 1-4 and 10-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,933,767 (“Hyakutake”).

10 In response, Applicant has rewritten the “objected to” claim 5 in independent form by amending the independent claim 1. As amended, the independent claim 1 includes the limitations of the “objected to” 5, as well as the limitations of the intervening claims 2 and 4. Thus, claims 2, 4 and 5 have been canceled. In addition, the independent claims 12 and 13 have been similarly amended.

15

Applicant respectfully submit that the amended independent claims 1, 12 and 13, as well as the dependent claims 3, 6-11 and 14, are now in condition for allowance. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

20

Respectfully submitted,
Johannes Van Nieuwenburg

25

Date: December 22, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300